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Background and Purpose: Organizations should implement new findings from the field of human resource management. If an organization wants to have successful and effective employees, they should be satisfied with all aspects of work and at the same time they should be feel commitment towards an organization. To have a full insight in employees, organizations have to take care of psychological side of employees, which manifests in psychological empowerment.

Design/Methodology/Approach: The survey was conducted among 409 university lecturers in Austria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Germany, Serbia, and Slovenia. The investigated constructs of psychological empowerment, job satisfaction and organisational commitment were compared. Spreitzer’s PEQ was used for the assessment of the psychological empowerment, Spector’s JSS for job satisfaction, and Allen’s and Meyer’s OCQ for the assessment of organisational commitment.

Results: The research showed that the highest level of psychological empowerment can be found among university lecturers from Serbia and the lowest from Germany. Job satisfaction level is the highest in Austria and the lowest in Slovenia. Affective organisational commitment is the highest in Slovenia and the lowest in Germany. Continuance organisational commitment scored the highest in Croatia and the lowest in Czech Republic. Additionally, the outcomes show the highest level of normative organisational commitment in Czech Republic and the lowest in Austria. Only affective organisational commitment was not found as statistically significant.

Conclusion: Knowledge of psychological empowerment, job satisfaction and organizational commitment can be helpful for leaders, because with this knowledge they can manage, develop and motivate employees properly.
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1 Introduction

In the 21st century, teachers are scientific workers and independent educational professionals (Tschannen-Moran, 2009). Higher education lecturers are driving forces of higher education institutions (Aslan, Shaukat, Ahmed, Shah & Mahfar, 2014) and their work is very stressful (Saner & Eyüpoğlu, 2012b). Their work is influenced by many factors; among them are psychological empowerment, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. According to Lee and Nie (2014) we should pay more attention to teachers’ psychological empowerment, because it has a big influence on their professional development and psychological well-being. Psychological empowerment raises individual’s convictions about their own effectiveness. Lecturer’s job satisfaction is also of great importance, because it plays an important role in satisfaction of students, higher education institution’s effectiveness (Lourdes Machado, Soares, Brites, Ferreira & Gouveia, 2011) and has a big influence on quality of lecturers’ work (Karabiyik & Korumaz, 2014). Lecturers work in complex environment, because they have a great variety of duties, such as teaching, helping students and researching, which can affect their level of job satisfaction (Yılmaz, Çelebi & Çakmak, 2014). Organizational commitment is a relationship between individual and organization ( Fanggida, Rolland, Suryana & Efdi, 2016). Satisfied and committed employees are crucial for higher institution’s success (Saner & Eyüpoğlu, 2012a).

2 Literature Review

This paragraph will provide the review of the scientific literature and previous research related to the psychological empowerment, organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

2.1 Psychological empowerment

Empowerment is a process of strengthening individuals’ feelings of their own effectiveness among other members of an organization (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). Considering the advancement of science and technology together with the increase of global competition, empowerment is recognized to be crucial for the companies’ effectiveness (Ergeneli, Ari & Metin, 2007). Empowerment is one of the key factors of organization’s success (Jose & Mampilly, 2014). Empowerment can be defined as individual’s internal (Shapira-Lishchinsky & Tsemach, 2014) or external process of feeling empowered (Shapira-Lishchinsky & Tsemach, 2014; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). It is also considered as act of empowering others (Menon, 2001). Empowerment has been defined in several different perspectives: process approach, structural approach, and psychological approach (Leach, Wall & Jackson 2003; Mathieu, Gilson & Ruddy 2006; Menon 2001; Spreitzer 1995b; Uner & Turan, 2010; Quiñones, Van den Broeck & De Witte, 2013). Advocates of the process approach define empowerment as the relationships between structural antecedents and resulting psychological states (Lee & Wei, 2011; Mathieu, Gilson & Ruddy, 2006). Advocates of the structural approach see empowerment as a set of management practices and managers’ behaviours that include the delegation of authority and responsibility to the employees (Lee & Wei, 2011; Mathieu, Gilson & Ruddy, 2006; Özaralli, 2003).

Advocates of the psychological approach contemplate empowerment as the psychological state of subordinates resulting from empowering practices at work (Lee & Wei, 2011; Mathieu, Gilson & Ruddy, 2006; Mishra & Spreitzer, 1998; Spreitzer, 1995b; Spreitzer, 1995a).

Psychological empowerment is a new approach of motivating and has gained great attention from managers (Edalatian Shahriri, Maleki, Koolivand & Meyvard, 2013); for this reasons, there are numerous definitions of this construct (Shapira-Lishchinsky & Tsemach, 2014). Conger, Kanungo and Menon (2000) defined psychological empowerment as a motivation and as a process of individuals’ perception of their own effectiveness in comparison to the other members in organization, together with a help of formal and informal procedures and techniques for encouraging effectiveness. Psychological empowerment can be defined as an active motivational orientation with regard to individual’s work role and individual’s feeling of being in control at work (Boudrias, Morin & Lajoie, 2014).

Psychological approach contemplate empowerment as the psychological state of subordinates resulting from empowering practices at work and it is defined as four-dimensional construct of employees’ perceptions (Kirkman & Rosen, 1999; Mishra & Spreitzer, 1998; Spreitzer, 1995b; Zhang, Song, Tsui & Fu, 2014): meaning (sense of meaningfulness that their work is important); competence (competence to perform their tasks well); self-determination (freedom to choose how they carry out their tasks) and impact (belief that their work has an impact on the effectiveness of the larger system). The concept of psychological empowerment plays an important role in behavioural, emotional and cognitive constructs, such as job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour (Wang, 2015).

Meaning is defined as the value employees assign to their job according to their beliefs and standards, together with the fit between the organization’s requirements of a task or work goal and personal values or ideas (Spreitzer, 1995b; Quinn & Spreitzer, 1997). Employees who perceive their work as important will likely have greater sense of commitment and will participate in the organization’s events more often plus they will be more focused on their work tasks; otherwise, the employees will be apathet-
ic and less willing to be involved in organization’s events (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). When employees perceive that their job requirements are meaningful, they will spend more effort on understanding problems from multiple perspectives and searching for different solutions using information from numerous sources (Gilson & Shalley 2004; Zhang & Bartol, 2010). Employees perceive meaning of work as intrinsic concern for specific job (Amenumey & Lockwood, 2008) and they believe that is one of three critical psychological states of intrinsic motivation (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). In teaching, meaning refers to professional relations, respect and comprehension from other lecturers, which are given based on their knowledge and capabilities (Shapira-Lishchinsky & Tsemach, 2014). Three main assignments of lecturers are teaching, researching and helping students (Lawrence, Ott & Bell, 2012; Veletsianos & Kimmons, 2013; Kelli, Adamsoo, Mets, Jonsson & Pisuke, 2013), but every lecturer develops their unique style of doing them (Hiristo, Lampinen & Syrjäkari, 2013).

Competence is defined as the employee’s beliefs in their capability to successfully accomplish their tasks (Spreitzer, 1995a; Quinones, Van den Broeck & De Witte, 2013). Employees’ perceive themselves as competent, when they are confident about their abilities to complete their all job tasks with success (Quinn & Spreitzer, 1997). It refers to the individual’s perception of the required abilities to cope with different work situations (Spreitzer, 2008). Competence derives from the concept of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977) and greater is individuals’ perception of self-efficacy, more committed they will be able to accomplish given tasks and they will be more effective (Goodale, Koerner & Roney, 1997; Taylor, 2013). Those individuals would be more initiative, persistence, and would show greater effort to deal with difficult situations (Bandura, 1977). In teaching, competence refers to ability of lecturers of their own capabilities to develop adequate teaching plan in to help students (Shapira-Lishchinsky & Tsemach, 2014). Their perception of self-efficacy is a key factor for reaching academic goals (El-Sayed, El-Zeiny & Adeyemo, 2014).

Self-determination is defined as employee’s sense of autonomy to make their own decision regarding job tasks, without feeling constant supervision (Spreitzer, 1995b). Employees who feel high sense of self-determination will be more flexible, creative, initiative, persistent and will have more self-control (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). Furthermore, they will respond better in stressful situations if they will feel high sense of self-determination (Goodale, Koerner & Roney, 1997). In teaching, self-determination refers to sense of autonomy at work (e.g. teaching plan, selection of study material) together with involvement in decision making concerning their work (e.g. financial plan, schedule) (Shapira-Lishchinsky & Tsemach, 2014).

Impact is defined as level of employee’s influence they have over the outcomes in the organization (Spreitzer, 1995b), working unit and ability to attract others to listen to their ideas (Quinn in Spreitzer, 1997). Self-determination is control over individual’s behaviour, while impact is control over individual’s working environment (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). In teaching, impact refers to individual’s ability to sense possibilities of influencing events in the organization (Shapira-Lishchinsky & Tsemach, 2014). Employees, who feel low sense of impact, are less persistent in reaching set goals (Taylor, 2013).

Seibert, Wang and Courtright (2011) showed that psychological empowerment consists of all four dimensions. Employees who are empowered will not wait passively for instructions yet they will actively change and affect their work environment, leading to greater efficiency (Sigler & Pearson, 2000). Empowered employees believe that they are important and influential in the organization, and that they feel greater sense of commitment (Kark, Shamir & Chen, 2003). Numerous researchers have shown that employees who feel empowered are more loyal to the organization (Avolio, Zhu, Koh & Bhatia, 2004; Liden, Wayne & Sparrowe, 2000). Psychological empowerment has a positive effect on employees’ self-efficacy and the result of this is that employees believe they can play an important part in adding to organization’s productivity (Martin & Bush, 2006). Psychological empowerment is not a fixed personality attribute, since it consists of cognitions that are shaped by the work environment (Stander & Rothmann, 2010).

### 2.2 Organizational commitment

Researchers have been investigating the relationship between employees and their employing organization for decades (Stinghamer et al., 2015), since they are aware of importance of employees, who are driving force of every organization (Jordan, Miglič & Marič, 2016). Organizational commitment of employees is one of the most important organizational behavioural issues faced by most organizations, for the reason that employees are not as committed as they were before (Lo, Ramayah & De Run, 2010).

Commitment is a strong psychological and social attachment to something or somebody (Tyree Jr., 1996). Organizational commitment is defined as an individual’s identification and involvement with a specific organization (Kalantarkousheh, Sharghi, Soleimani & Ramezani, 2014). It is reflection of individual’s psychological state, which refers to the employee’s organization and defines a relationship between the employee and the organization (Boštjančič, 2010). Individuals, who are more psychologically attached to the organization, will be more productive and satisfied (Hunter & Thatcher, 2007). Allen and Meyer (1990a) firstly formed two basic types of organizational commitment, but later they added the third one and formed the three-component model, which includes affective organizational commitment, normative organizational com-

Affective commitment is defined as attachment based on emotions or desire (Meyer & Allen, 1991). The majority of the literature has explored affective commitment (Eisenberger et al., 2010; Liden, Wayne & Sparrowe, 2000; Riketta, 2002; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), while normative and continuance commitment received less attention (Gutierrez, Candela & Carver, 2012). Affective commitment refers to employees’ emotional attachment to the organization, identification with the organization and involvement in the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1993). Revealed positive outcomes of affective commitment have been increased job involvement, attendance, performance, job satisfaction, low rates of attrition and decreased intent to leave (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer, Allen & Smith, 1993; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch & Topolnytsky, 2002). Employees with a strong affective commitment have a desire to maintain their work role and are going to put more effort into their work (Choi, Tran & Park, 2015; Luchak & Gellatly, 2007).

Normative commitment is defined as attachment based on perceived obligation (Meyer & Allen, 1991), a sense of loyalty or duty (Allen & Meyer, 1993; Meyer & Parfyonova, 2010). Employees with a strong continuance commitment continue working in their organization because they need to (McCallum, Forret & Wolff, 2014; Nakra, 2014; Ravangard, Sajjadnia & Ansarizade, 2013). Continuance commitment is defined as attachment based on perceived cost (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Allen & Meyer, 1993) and refers to an employee’s intention to leave or wish to remain a part of the organization and depends on their recognition of the availability of alternatives if they want to leave the organization (Namasivayam & Zhao, 2007). Highly continuance committed employees will differ in behavioural and potentially cognitive outcomes at work for the reason that they may feel trapped in the job and will produce only the minimum necessary to keep the job (Gutierrez, Candela & Carver, 2012).

2.3 Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction has a long-standing tradition in organizational research (Nguyen & Borteyrou, 2016) and due to that fact we can find numerous definitions (Westover & Taylor, 2010; Gözükara & Çolakoğlu, 2016). Understanding job satisfaction is of great importance for two reasons: personally for employees and for managers, because it affects employees’ productivity (Keles, 2015). Job satisfaction is defined as individual’s affective reaction or a cognitive attitude toward job; it is an extent to which individuals like or dislike their job (Ivancevich & Matteson, 2002; Spector, 1997).

Individuals who have high level job satisfaction generally have positive attitude towards their work; if they have low level job satisfaction, they generally have negative attitude towards their work (Robbins & Judge, 2015). If we want to understand the complexity of job satisfaction as a concept, we have to understand the relationship between individual and an organization, because work itself produces feelings which cause a satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Spector, 1997). This perspective can help organizations to retain their employees (Saari & Judge, 2004; Westlund & Hannon, 2008).

Job satisfaction can result from organizational climate (Mincu, 2015) together with individual’s perception and evaluation of a job, which is influenced by the individual’s unique circumstances such as needs, values and expectations (Sempane, Rieger & Roodt, 2002). If employees are dissatisfied and they see chance for work in other organization, they will leave organization without sense of guilt (Martins & Coetzee, 2007).

Employees’ job satisfaction is an indicator of organizational effectiveness, which is influenced by organisational and dispositional factors (Rothmann & Coetzee, 2002). Majority of managers are aware of importance of job satisfaction, because they know that satisfied employee is also a productive employee (Saari & Judge, 2004). For optimal effectiveness the whole individual’s potential is needed; this is the reason why is job satisfaction so important (Rothmann & Coetzee, 2002).

Job satisfaction is a main concept in organizational psychology, and research on its determinants and outcomes is significant for the development of appropriate human resources management practices (Hauff, Richter & Tressin, 2015). Employees’ job satisfaction affects their performance and commitment. The assessment of the employee’s work conditions is reflected in the attitudes, which are the unit of measurement of job satisfaction (Hajdukova & Klementova, 2015). It is an individual’s emotional attitude towards work and work environment. During the investigation of job satisfaction, it is necessary to distinguish whether a person is completely satisfied at work, or is satisfied only by several factors, the extent to which various aspects of the work are important to him/her and to recognize if it is only current state of satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Gok, Karatuna & Karaca, 2015).

Job satisfaction is influenced by personal and organizational factors, which cause emotional reaction which affects organizational commitment (Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979). Job satisfaction is interrelated with emotions and because of that it affects organization as a whole: productivity (Humphrey, Nahrgang & Morgeson, 2007; Morrison, 2008), job performance (Riketta, 2008), fluctuation and absenteeism (Spector, 2008). Motivated employees are a key factor to organization’s success and it is of great importance to understand what motivates them; with this knowledge, we get committed employees (Schein, 1996).

Employees’ job satisfaction also affects the health of their personal relationships outside of work environment.
(Chen, Brown, Bowers & Chang, 2015) together with their self-evaluation (Wu & Griffin, 2012). Understanding job satisfaction is important for understanding if employment contributes to an individual’s overall quality of life (Park, Seo, Park, Bettini & Smith, 2016). Job satisfaction is a specific job attitude relating to the reaction an individual has to either their work as a whole or specific facets of the job (Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2012). Compatibility of employees’ values and beliefs with those of the organization can result in increased job satisfaction (Kim, 2012).

2.4 National culture in chosen CEE countries

National culture is a collective mental programme which differentiates the members of one group of people from another (Hofstede, 1980) and varies depending on social environment in which they are acquired (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010). National culture is a collective phenomenon, because it is at least partly shared with people who live or lived within the same social environment where it was learned. It six dimensions are: power distance, collectivism versus individualism, femininity versus masculinity, uncertainty avoidance, long term orientation versus short term normative orientation, and indulgence versus restraint (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010).

The power distance represents the degree of an acceptance unequally distributed power, even though the fundamental issue is how a society handles inequalities among individuals. The individualism is defined as a preference for a loosely social framework in which individuals are expected to take care of only themselves and their close relatives. On the contrary, collectivism represents a preference for a tightly social framework in which individuals can expect their close members to look after them in exchange for undoubtably loyalty. The masculinity represents a preference in society for achievement, heroism, assertiveness and material rewards for success, where a society is very competitive. On the contrary, the femininity represents a preference for cooperation, modesty, caring for the weak and quality of life, where a society is more oriented towards consensus. The uncertainty avoidance is defined as the degree to which the members of a society feel uncomfortable with uncertainty and ambiguity. The long term orientation versus can be named also as pragmatic orientation short term normative orientation. In the academic environment, monumentalism versus flexhumility is sometimes also used. Indulgence represents relatively free gratification of basic and natural human drives in society related to enjoying life and having fun. On the contrary, restraint stands for a society that suppresses gratification of needs, regulated by strict social norms.

Hofstede’s dimensions of national culture scores for each country are shown in Table 1; if the score is lower than 50, it means the culture score is relatively low on the scale, and if the score is over 50, it is relatively high. The countries scores differentiate extremely for each dimension. In our study, all dimensions are represented with a country with low score or high score, excluding uncertainty avoidance. Based on studied literature and previous research, we propose our research questions:

- RQ1: Does lecturer’s psychological empowerment differ by country?
- RQ2: Does lecturer’s job satisfaction differ by country?
- RQ3: Does lecturer’s affective organizational commitment differ by country?
- RQ4: Does lecturer’s continuance organizational commitment differ by country?
- RQ5: Does lecturer’s normative organizational commitment differ by country?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>PDI</th>
<th>IDV</th>
<th>MAS</th>
<th>UAI</th>
<th>LTO</th>
<th>IND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PDI (Power Distance Index), IDV (Individualism versus Collectivism), MAS (Masculinity versus Femininity), UAI (Uncertainty Avoidance Index), LTO (Long Term Orientation versus Short Term Normative Orientation), IND (Indulgence versus Restraint) (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010).
3 Research methodology

3.1 Participants

The participants in the research were lecturers from Austria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Germany, and Slovenia. The full set of questionnaires was completed by a total of 409 lecturers, of whom 195 (47.7%) were men and 214 (52.3%) were women. Out of 409 respondents, 84 (20.5%) come from Slovenia, 107 (26.2%) from Croatia, 71 (17.4%) from Serbia, 34 (8.3%) from Austria, 39 (9.5%) from Czech Republic, and 74 (18.1%) from Germany. They work at social science 227 (55.5%) or natural sciences 182 (44.5%) institutions. The average age of respondents was 41.3 years and in average they work for 14.6 years.

Out of 409 respondents, 227 (55.5%) were professors and 182 (44.5%) were other pedagogical workers. According to academic rank, respondents were: 54 (13.2%) full professors, 71 (17.4%) associate professors, 102 (24.9%) assistant professors, 21 (5.1%) senior lecturers, 18 (4.4%) lecturers, 11 (2.7%) language instructors, 3 (0.7%) senior research fellows, 27 (6.6%) research fellows, 36 (8.8%) teaching assistants with PhD and 66 (16.1%) assistants.

3.2 Instruments

Psychological Empowerment Questionnaire (PEQ) was used for measuring psychological empowerment developed by Spreitzer (1995b). The 12-item scale is composed of 4 dimensions: competence (e.g., “I am confident about my ability to do my job”), self-determination (e.g., “I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job”), meaning (e.g., “My job activities are personally meaningful to me”) and impact (e.g., “I have significant influence over what happens in my department”). The response scale was a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 7 (completely agree). The higher scores indicate the perception of being more psychologically empowered. Evidence of the internal consistency of the psychological empowerment has been reported in numerous studies (Faulkner & Laschinger 2008; Seibert, Silver & Randolph, 2004; Spreitzer 1995b). The coefficient of reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) was .88, respectively.

Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was used for measuring organizational commitment developed by Allen and Meyer (1990b). The 24-item scale is composed of 3 dimensions: affective organizational commitment (e.g., “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization”), normative organizational commitment (e.g., “I think that people these days move from company to company too often”) and continuance organizational commitment (e.g., “It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to”). The higher scores indicate the perception of being more committed to the organization. The three-component model of organisational commitment has been tested extensively in different settings; differences between results in North America and others countries are small, what indicates possibility of generalization of the model (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch & Topolnytsky, 2002). The coefficient of reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) was .80 for affective organizational commitment, .73 for continuance organizational commitment, and .58 for normative organizational commitment.

Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) was used for measuring job satisfaction developed by Spector (1997). The 36-item scale is composed of 9 dimensions: pay (e.g., “I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do”), promotion (e.g., “There is really too little chance for promotion on my job”), supervision (e.g., “My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job”), fringe benefits (e.g., “I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive”), contingent rewards (e.g., “When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive”), operating procedures (e.g., “Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult”), co-workers (e.g., “I like the people I work with”), nature of work (e.g., “I feel my job is meaningless”) and communication (e.g., “Communications seem good within this organization”). The questionnaire was used in more than fifty studies in different context and industries (Job Satisfaction Survey, 2011). The coefficient of reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) was .81, respectively.

3.3 Data collection

Empirical research on psychological empowerment, organisational commitment and job satisfaction of lecturers in six CEE countries was performed by survey method. To obtain data, we prepared and used two separate survey questionnaires – one in Slovene and other one in English. We designed online questionnaire, which were sent to lecturers via e-mail in spring 2016. After conducting online research, primary data was controlled and edited. For processing and analysing data, we used IBM SPSS Statistics 24.

4 Results

In our research, we studied differences in psychological empowerment, job satisfaction and organizational commitment of lecturers from six CEE countries.

RQ1: Does lecturer’s psychological empowerment differ by country?

Table 2 shows the number of respondents, means, standard deviations and statistically significant differences (bolded) for psychological empowerment. According to mean, the
most psychologically empowered are lecturers in Serbia, 5.72, while the least psychologically empowered are lecturers in Germany, 5.18. A Kolmogorov – Smirnov test was used to test for normality and assumption of normality was violated, \( p = .000 \). Leven’s test for homogeneity of variances was found to be violated \( F(5, 403) = 4.98, p = .000 \); due to that fact we had to conduct Welch’s analysis of variance. Analysis of variance showed differences of lecturer’s psychological empowerment by country, \( F(5, 147) = 6.79, p = .000, \eta^2_p = .056 \). Post hoc analysis using Games – Howell’s post hoc test indicated significant differences of lecturer’s psychological empowerment between Slovenia and Germany \( (p = .000) \), and Germany and Serbia \( (p = .000) \).

**RQ2: Does lecturer’s job satisfaction differ by country?**

Table 3 shows the number of respondents, means, standard deviations and statistically significant differences (bolded) for job satisfaction. According to mean, the most satisfied lecturers are in Austria, 4.33, while the least satisfied are lecturers in Slovenia, 3.93. A Kolmogorov – Smirnov test was used to test for normality and assumption of normality was violated, \( p = .000 \). Leven’s test for homogeneity of variances was found to be violated \( F(5, 403) = 4.37, p = .000 \); due to that fact we had to conduct Welch’s analysis of variance. Analysis of variance showed differences of lecturer’s job satisfaction by country, \( F(5, 146) = 4.18, p = .000, \eta^2_p = .060 \). Post hoc analysis using Games – Howell’s post hoc test indicated significant differences of lecturer’s job satisfaction between Slovenia and Croatia \( (p = .034) \), Slovenia and Serbia \( (p = .001) \), and Slovenia and Austria \( (p = .025) \).

**RQ3: Does lecturer’s affective organizational commitment differ by country?**

Table 4 shows the number of respondents, means and standard deviations for affective organizational commitment. According to mean, the highest level of affective commitment is perceived by lecturers in Slovenia, 4.48, while...
the lowest level of affective commitment is perceived by lectures in Germany, 4.16. A Kolmogorov–Smirnov test was used to test for normality and assumption of normality was violated, \( p = .000 \). Leven’s test for homogeneity of variances was found to be violated \( F(5, 403) = 7.95, p = .000 \); due to that fact we had to conduct Welch’s analysis of variance. Analysis of variance showed no statistically significant differences of lecturer’s affective organizational commitment by country, \( F(5, 145) = 1.77, p = .123, \eta^2_p = .012 \).

**RQ4: Does lecturer’s continuance organizational commitment differ by country?**

Table 5 shows the number of respondents, means, standard deviations and statistically significant differences (bolded) for continuance organizational commitment. According to mean, the highest level of continuance commitment is perceived by lecturers in Croatia, 4.52, while the lowest level of continuance commitment is perceived by lectures in Czech Republic, 3.83. A Kolmogorov–Smirnov test was used to test for normality and assumption of normality was violated, \( p = .002 \). Leven’s test for homogeneity of variances was found to be violated \( F(5, 403) = 5.14, p = .000 \); due to that fact we had to conduct Welch’s analysis of variance. Analysis of variance showed differences of lecturer’s continuance organizational commitment by country, \( F(5, 147) = 3.23, p = .009, \eta^2_p = .041 \). Post hoc analysis using Games–Howell’s post hoc test indicated significant differences of lecturer’s psychological continuance organizational commitment between Slovenia and Czech Republic \( (p = .043) \), and Croatia and Czech Republic \( (p = .011) \).

**RQ5: Does lecturer’s normative organizational commitment differ by country?**

Table 6 shows the number of respondents, means, standard deviations and statistically significant differences (bolded) for normative organizational commitment. According to mean, the highest level of normative commitment is perceived by lecturers in Czech Republic, 4.04, while the lowest level of normative commitment is perceived by lectures in Austria, 3.43. A Kolmogorov–Smirnov test was used to test for normality and assumption of normality was violated, \( p = .000 \). Leven’s test for homogeneity of variances was found to be violated \( F(5, 403) = 2.43, p = .035 \); due to that fact we had to conduct Welch’s analysis of variance. Analysis of variance showed differences of lecturer’s normative organizational commitment by country, \( F(5, 148) = 2.46, p = .036, \eta^2_p = .031 \). Post hoc analysis using Games–Howell’s post hoc test indicated significant differences of lecturer’s psychological normative organizational commitment between Slovenia and Czech Republic \( (p = .043) \), and Croatia and Czech Republic \( (p = .011) \).

### Table 4: Means and standard deviations for affective organizational commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( SD )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. \( N = 409 \).*

### Table 5: Means, standard deviations, and analysis of variance (ANOVA) for continuance organizational commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( SD )</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>(.963)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>(.911)</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>(.545)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>(.999)</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>(.932)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>(.998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>(.364)</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>(.083)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>(.992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>(.043)*</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>(.011)*</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>(.354)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *\( p < .05, n = 409 \).*
Table 6: Means, standard deviations, and differences analysis of variance (ANOVA) for normative organizational commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.07 (.992)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.04 (1.00)</td>
<td>.11 (.945)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.35 (.267)</td>
<td>.28 (.457)</td>
<td>.37 (.170)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.03 (1.00)</td>
<td>.04 (.999)</td>
<td>.07 (.990)</td>
<td>.32 (.300)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.27 (.497)</td>
<td>.33 (.196)</td>
<td>.23 (.662)</td>
<td>.62 (.013)*</td>
<td>.30 (.288)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05, n = 409.

– Howell’s post hoc test indicated significant differences of lecturer’s normative organizational commitment between Austria and Czech Republic (p = .013).

5 Discussion

Our study has shown that lecturers in all six CEE countries feel psychologically empowered, because all scores are well over the scale midpoint. Statistically significant differences in psychological empowerment were found between Slovenia and Germany, and Serbia and Germany. It is of great importance for managers to have employees with high level of psychological empowerment, because it shows that they see themselves as competent to do their work, they have impact on actions in their work environment, they perceive themselves as effective and they see their work as important. Psychologically empowered employees will be more satisfied with their job (Seibert, Wang & Courtright, 2011) and they will be more committed to their organization (Chang, Shih & Lin, 2010).

Results have shown that lecturers are satisfied with their job, because all score are well over the scale midpoint. Statistically significant differences in job satisfaction were found between Slovenia and Croatia, Slovenia and Serbia, and Slovenia and Austria. Knowing the level of job satisfaction is important for managers, because it is associated with a number of desirable organizational outcomes such as high productivity, low absenteeism, low turnover rates (Yang & Wang, 2013), mental and physical health (Shahmohammadi, 2015), for what strives any organization. Employees with the highest level of job satisfaction are most likely to recognise organisational values and goals, and will remain with the organisation longer (Ahmad & Oranye, 2010; Lourdes Machado et al., 2011). Managers should focus on employees’ job satisfaction, because otherwise they will leave organization together with the knowledge (Alniaçik, Alniaçik, Erat & Akçin, 2013; Tnay, Othman, Siong & Lim, 2013); on the other hand, their performance on professional level will be worsen (Şirin, 2009). Employees will be satisfied, when they will perform their job with enthusiasm and will be praised for work done (Avram, Ionescu & Mincu, 2015). Organizations’ effectiveness depends on employees’ job satisfaction (Bitmiş & Ergeneli, 2013), although it has to be pointed out, that perception of job satisfaction is a subjective perception which can differ from individual to individual, so it can vary (Belias, Koustelios, Vairaktarakis & Sdrolias, 2015).

According to the results in our study, the highest score was found for affective organizational commitment, but it was not found as statistically significant. The scores for all countries were above the scale midpoint, what suggest that employees feel desire to be in their organization. Positive outcomes of employees’ affective commitment are greater effectiveness, bigger desire for work, readiness for extra work (Choi, Tran & Park, 2015; Luchak & Gellatly, 2007), and desire to stay in the organization (Kleine in Weißenberger, 2014).

According to the result in our study, statistically significant differences in continuance organizational commitment were found between Slovenia and Czech Republic, and Croatia and Czech Republic. The scores for all countries were above the scale midpoint, what suggest that they feel trapped in their organizations and will only produce the minimum necessary to keep the job (Lambert, Minor, Wells in Hogan, 2015).

According to the results in our study, statistically significant differences in normative organizational commitment were found between Slovenia and Czech Republic, and Croatia and Czech Republic. The scores for all countries were above the scale midpoint, what suggest that they feel trapped in their organizations and will only produce the minimum necessary to keep the job (Lambert, Minor, Wells in Hogan, 2015).

Although this research makes important contribution,
implications for theory, research and practice, current results and conclusions are evaluated on base of six CEE countries. Potential limitation of this research is that individual’s national culture can differ and it is not in line with majority. Therefore, we have to be aware of that if we want to measure a nation’s cultural characteristics for an unbiased study a large number of individuals are required (Lee, Trimi & Kim, 2013) and also for generalization of the results.

6 Conclusion

Understanding the importance of employees’ psychological empowerment, job satisfaction and organizational commitment is of great importance for managers, because knowing the levels of mentioned constructs can help them how to handle them appropriate and also how to motivate them. Additionally, it can genuinely assist managers to eliminate disturbing factors which directly or indirectly influence on psychological empowerment, job satisfaction and/or organizational commitment.

Our research has been conducted among lecturers in higher education in six CEE countries based on different national cultures, where we found significant differences in psychological empowerment, normative and continuance organizational commitment, and job satisfaction; on the contrary, we did not find significant differences in affective organizational commitment.
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